

## REMARKS

Claim 29 has been amended. Claims 18-29 remain in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested. The Examiner's comments are shown in bold.

### *Claim Objections*

**Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim should end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.**

The Applicant has made the appropriate correction to Claim 29.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

**Claims 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being clearly unpatentable over Demott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,774,067). . . .**

#### Introductory Comments:

Section 2142 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) cites the requirements for making a case *prima facie* of obviousness. Section 2142 of the MPEP states "*To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.*" Section 2143 of the MPEP goes on to establish the requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness by expanding upon the three basic criteria cited above. The Applicant submits that the Office Action mailed on 8/25/2005 does not meet the above stated criteria in that the single cited reference (U.S. Patent No.

6,774,067 to Demott et al.) only discloses a mat and does not disclose or suggest any of the golf-related limitations recited in the claims of the application as amended.

Regarding Claim 18:

Claim 18 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:

- a putter toe line disposed upon said surface parallel to said longitudinal axis;*
- a putter heel line disposed upon said surface parallel to said longitudinal axis;*

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 18 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 19:

Claim 19 depends from allowable Claim 18 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 20:

Claim 20 depends from allowable Claim 19 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 21:

Claim 21 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:

- said putter toe line spaced apart from said putter heel line by about the length of the putter head, so that when the head of the putter is placed upon said practice putting pad with the face perpendicular to said longitudinal axis, the toe of the putter resides upon the putter toe line and the heel of the putter resides upon the putter heel line.*

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 21 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be

allowable. Additionally, Claim 21 depends from allowable Claim 18 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 22:

Claim 22 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:

- said putter toe line having an outside boundary;*
- said putter heel line having an outside boundary; and,*
- a perpendicular distance between said outside boundary of said putter toe line and said outside boundary of said putter heel line being about five inches.*

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 22 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be allowable. Additionally, Claim 22 depends from allowable Claim 21 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 23:

Claim 23 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:

- said putter toe line and said putter heel line being about one quarter of an inch wide.*

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 23 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be allowable. Additionally, Claim 23 depends from allowable Claim 22 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 24:

Claim 24 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:

- said putter toe line spaced apart from said putter heel line by about the length of the putter head, so that when the head of the putter is placed upon said practice*

*putting pad with the face perpendicular to said longitudinal axis, the toe of the putter resides upon the putter toe line and the heel of the putter resides upon the putter heel line;*

*-said putter toe line having an outside boundary;*

*-said putter heel line having an outside boundary;*

*-a perpendicular distance between said outside boundary of said putter toe line and said outside boundary of said putter heel line being about five inches; and,*

*-said putter toe line and said putter heel line being about one quarter of an inch wide.*

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 24 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be allowable. Additionally, Claim 24 depends from allowable Claim 18 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 25:

Claim 25 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:

*-a putter toe line disposed upon said surface parallel to said longitudinal axis;*

*-a putter heel line disposed upon said surface parallel to said longitudinal axis;*

*and,*

*-said putter toe line spaced apart from said putter heel line by about the length of the putter head, so that when the head of the putter is placed upon said practice putting pad with the face perpendicular to said longitudinal axis, the toe of the putter resides upon the putter toe line and the heel of the putter resides upon the putter heel line.*

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations

not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 25 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be allowable.

Regarding Claim 26:

Claim 26 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:

- said putter toe line having an outside boundary;
- said putter heel line having an outside boundary; and,
- a perpendicular distance between said outside boundary of said putter toe line and said outside boundary of said putter heel line being about five inches.

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 26 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be allowable. Additionally, Claim 26 depends from allowable Claim 25 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 27:

Claim 27 contains the following limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in Demott:  
*said putter toe line and said putter heel line being about one quarter of an inch wide.*

Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 27 is unobvious over Demott et al. and should be allowable. Additionally, Claim 27 depends from allowable Claim 26 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 28:

Claim 28 depends from allowable Claim 27 and is therefore also allowable.

Regarding Claim 29:

Claim 29 depends from allowable Claim 28 and is therefore also allowable.

Form PTO-948 was not included in the Office Action, therefore the Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ted Masters", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ted Masters Reg. 36,209  
5121 Spicewood Dr.  
Charlotte, NC 28227

(704) 545-0037